

Serial No. 10/632,546, Filed 5/19/04

REMARKS

Claims 1-9 are presently pending in the application. New claims 8 and 9 have been added by this Amendment. Claims 1 and 9 are in independent form.

The Specification has been amended to address certain informalities.

Claim 1 has been amended, which overcomes the objection to the drawings and the rejection under §112, second paragraph.

Claim 4 has been amended to clarify the relationship of the opposing ends, which overcomes the objection to claim 4.

Claims 1-7 were rejected under §103 over Young in view of Smith. The Examiner acknowledges that Young does not disclose the laterally spaced apart air springs. The Examiner argues that it would obvious to modify Young with Smith "to provide enhanced ride characteristics as well as improve automatic load leveling and corner control." The Examiner's motivation is improper for at least two reasons. First, Young utilizes a shock absorber. There is no reason that an air spring needs to be used instead of the shock absorber of Young. That is, enhanced ride characteristics and load leveling and corner control can be employed without the use of an air spring specifically. Said another way, there is no suggestion or motivation in the references to replace the shock absorber in Young with the air spring of Smith. The Examiner is picking and choosing elements to make the rejection. For this reason alone, the rejection must be withdrawn.

Second, Young describes a sled apparatus that is to be used for entertainment purposes in a manner similar to skiing. The sled apparatus employs numerous hand levers and foot petals to


Serial No. 10/632,546, Filed 5/19/04

enable the driver of the sled to provide input to the steering and suspension to steer and tilt the sled. In particular, the sled can be tilted rather dramatically using the foot petals, as described in paragraphs 51 and 52, to lean the sled into a hill. By way of contrast, Smith discloses a adaptive vehicle system for use in passenger cars. The operation of the system in Smith is contrary to the desired objectives of Young. For example, in automatic load leveling and cornering control used in Smith would defeat the intentional efforts of the driver of the sled in Young to tilt the sled and navigate down a hill in a manner similar to skiing, as described in paragraph 54. In summary, the ride characteristics, automatic load leveling, and cornering control that is so desirable in Smith is contrary to the objectives of Young. Accordingly, the teachings of each of the reference are incompatible with one another and one of ordinary skill would not be motivated to modify young to use the system of Smith.

Claim 8 recites that the knuckles are rotatable about an axis that is provided by the first and second pivotal connections. Young does not pivot about these connections.

New independent claim 9 is similar to original claim 1, however, it does not recite a frame.

It is believed that this application is in condition for allowance. If any fees or extensions of time are required, please charge to Deposit Account No. 50-1482.

Respectfully submitted,

CARLSON, GASKEY & OLDS

William S. Gottschalk
Registration No. 44,130
400 W. Maple, Suite 350
Birmingham, MI 48009
(248) 988-8360

Dated: 12/8/05